

## **REMARKS**

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on March 31, 2005. Claims 1, 5, 12, 15, 16, 18, 23, 26, 27 and 28 are amended such that claims 1-28 are now pending in this application.

### ***Double Patenting Rejection***

Claims 1-28 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, 8, 27, 28, 37 and 40 of copending Application No. 09/746,739 in view of Finnila, U.S. Patent No. 5,847,784. Applicant notes the provisional nature of this rejection, and will consider filing a Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b)(iv) should the co-pending application issue prior to issuance of the above claims herein to obviate this rejection.

### ***§102 Rejection of the Claims***

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Finnila, U.S. Patent No. 5,847,784.

#### **Claims 1-17**

Applicant can not find in Finnila:

“at least one lens assembly being configured to provide magnification having a magnitude of greater than 1 such that the respective projected sectional image on the screen is larger than the corresponding sectional image on the display device, wherein the lens assemblies provide magnification to merge adjacent projected sectional images together to eliminate the dead-band regions from the tiled image” as recited in amended claims 1 and 12.

Applicant notes that there does not appear to be any teaching or suggestion that the relay optics 16 in Finnila (cited by the Examiner in the rejection as lens assemblies) provide any type of magnification. Applicant further notes that there is no mention of dead-band regions in Finnila.

Claims 2-11 and 13-17 depend from respective claims 1 and 12 such that claims 2-11 and 13-17 incorporate all the limitations of claims 1 and 12. Therefore, Finnila does not appear to

describe the subject matter of claims 2-11 and 13-17 for the reasons provided above with regard to claims 1 and 12.

Applicant further submits with regard to claims 5 and 15 that Finnila does not teach or suggest that “the detector moves relative to an element displayed on the screen” as recited in amended claims 5 and 15. Applicant notes that there does not appear to be any teaching or suggestion that the detector 38 in Finnila (cited by the Examiner as the detector in the rejection) is able to move at all, much less move relative to an element displayed on the screen. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner’s attention to col. 5, lines 36-38 of Finnila

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-17 are respectfully requested.

Claims 18-25

Applicant also can not find in Finnila “magnifying each of the displayed sectional images to a magnitude of greater than 1” in combination with “projecting the magnified sectional images onto a screen such that the projected sectional images are merged into a tiled image which eliminates the dead-band regions from the tiled image” as recited in amended claim 18.

Applicant again notes that (i) there is no mention of dead-band regions in Finnila; and (ii) Finnila does not appear to teach or suggest that the relay optics 16 in Finnila (cited by the Examiner in the rejection as lens assemblies) provide any type of magnification.

Claims 19-25 depend from claim 18 such that claims 19-25 incorporate all the limitations of claim 18. Therefore, Finnila does not appear to describe the subject matter of claims 19-25 for the reasons provided above with regard to claim 18.

Applicant further submits with regard to claims 5 and 15 that Finnila does not teach or suggest “wherein detecting the tiled image includes moving a detector relative to an element displayed on the screen” as recited in amended claim 23. Applicant notes that there does not appear to be any teaching or suggestion that the detector 38 in Finnila (cited by the Examiner as the detector in the rejection) is able to move at all, much less move relative to an element displayed on the screen (see col. 5, lines 36-38 of Finnila).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 18-25 are respectfully requested.

Claim 26

Applicant also can not find in Finnila “means for magnifying the displayed sectional images to a magnitude greater than 1” in combination with “means for projecting the magnified sectional images that are displayed on each section of each display device onto a screen with the projected sectional images merged into a tiled image which has the dead-band regions eliminated from the tiled image” as recited in amended claim 26. Applicant again notes that Finnila does not appear to teach or suggest that the relay optics 16 in Finnila (cited by the Examiner in the rejection as lens assemblies) provide any type of magnification. In addition, there does not appear to be any mention of dead-band regions in Finnila.

Reconsideration and allowance of claim 26 are respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 28

Applicant also can not find in Finnila (i) “means for moving the detector relative to the tiled image” as recited in amended claim 27; or (ii) “moving the detector relative to the tiled image” as recited in amended claim 28. As discussed above, there does not appear to be any teaching or suggestion that the detector 38 in Finnila (cited by the Examiner as the detector in the rejection) is able to move at all, much less move relative to an element displayed on the screen. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner’s attention to col. 5, lines 36-38 of Finnila.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 27 and 28 are respectfully requested.

Reservation of Right to File Continuation or Divisional Applications

Applicant respectfully traverses the pending rejections and reserves the right to reintroduce any original claims in one or more continuation or divisional applications at a later date.

Reservation of Right to Swear Behind References

Applicant reserves the right to swear behind any references which are cited in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§102(a), 102(e), 103/102(a), and 103/102(e). Statements distinguishing the claimed subject matter over the cited references are not to be interpreted as admissions that the references are prior art.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612) 373-6972 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MATTHEW B. DUBIN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6972

Date 5-9-2005

By   
Bradley A. Forrest  
Reg. No. 30,837

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 9th day of May, 2005.

Name

Dawn M. Forde

Signature

